

Communities of Opportunity

Strategic Framing and Communications

Meeting Notes

December 5, 2014

Interim Governance Group Members Present: Michael Brown, Deanna Dawson, David Fleming, Hilary Franz, Betsy Jones, Paola Maranan, Gordon McHenry, Jeff Natter, Adrienne Quinn, Michael Woo

Staff and Guests Present: Kirsten Wysen, Alice Ito, Aaron Robertson, A.J. McClure, Cheryl Markham, Nadine Chan, Marguerite Ro, Sharon Bogan, Matias Valenzuela, Holly Rohr Tran

Guests Present for webinar-only portion of the meeting: Jennifer DeYoung, Denise Sharify, Gloria Albetta, Nicole Sadow-Hasenberg, Lin Song, Eyob Mazengia, Ngozi Oleru, Blishda Lacet, Keith Seinfeld, Sarah Ross-Viles, Travis Erickson, Katherine Cortes, Devin Culbertson (Enterprise Community Partners), Victoria Garcia (Seattle Children's), James Wilson

Presentation: Communicating about Opportunity in Racially Diverse Places

Tiffany Manuel, Ph.D., Vice President for Knowledge, Impact and Strategy at Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., presented [this webinar](#) to the group, which lays out pathways to public engagement using cognitive science to help reframe the public conversation.

A brief question and answer session followed the presentation and is included in the recording linked above.

Discussion of current Communities of Opportunity (COO) materials

The group and Dr. Manuel reviewed the Interim Governance Plan and current version of the Progress Report. Discussion points included:

- Off to a great start; as we broaden message out to those that aren't part of this conversation already, will get harder
- Folks identify with different geographic boundaries: regional vs. city or neighborhood
- People need to see that they are a part of this; See as "us" and not "them"
- Inclusive visuals are really important. Approach in same way as narrative part of the story. (Foreground the background, start with why, then have others in the community talk about it, then have personal stories. The story of "us" comes alive.)
- Invite folks to a conversation about how to succeed in the future, be a part of the solution
- Need to have business at this table, especially when talking about prosperity
- Concern about moving to more diffuse message and not talking explicitly about race
 - Get to "slow thinking" before approaching the "race drawer;" perhaps start with talking about disparities in place
 - Know your audience – catering to the lowest denominator isn't always the way to go

- Place matters and race matters; organizations with equity as part of their mission are remiss if not naming race

Focus Statement, framing and messaging to key audiences

The group discussed the need for a focus statement, and after discussion, agreed upon the following:

“Communities of Opportunity is a place-based initiative that aims to improve race, health and socio-economic equity in King County.”

Additional points noted during the small group discussion and report out include:

- The future health of the whole King County region – physical, mental & economic health – depends on the health of each place within the county – because we have a regional economy
- Regional economy will be more competitive when everyone is able to participate – in workforce, business, community institutions, civic life
- There are profound disparities that are stark and population-based. We see repeated geographic patterns.
- About sharing power; learning from communities what improved well-being is
- Since many changes being sought are long-term, early indicators of success need to be identified and measured; measures may be of processes
- Call out structural racism as a cause of some issues
- Be clear about what makes COO different: place-based, collective impact, founding partners, etc.
- Systems: what happens in the neighborhoods, affects regional economy
- More definition about “what” COO is doing will come through in the place-based partnerships
 - Create room for communities to tell the IGG what they want to work on
 - Ask local stakeholder table to look at how to collectively allocate resources in a more efficient way and for better outcomes

Interim Guidance Group (IGG) Guidance on site selection process

Members discussed the upcoming **site selection process** including the timeline and decision process and criteria. Feedback included:

- Retain some openness when considering a lead organizations’ track record of being able to engage vs. a proposal of coalition that is willing to work together
- Balance for geographic diversity after objective scoring
- This review is mostly about the “who.” The “what” is part of the co-design process.
- Suggest having a criteria that’s more open-ended – allow the community to tell us about factors that we should be considering when considering their application
- Information gained during site visits will inform second round of scoring/narrowing of pool.
- Avoid labeling/framing of “winners” and “losers”

- With all applicants, consider their fit for other known funding sources – e.g., Partnership to Improve Community Health grant, Community Development Block Grant, additional funding made available through the Satterberg Foundation (up to \$1M year/3 years)
- Funding 3 places is still the right number for this round, given the current scope and support resources
- Add criteria (perhaps in catalyst section) about utilizing resources that may come available through Living Cities partnership, e.g. low interest loans, etc.

Next steps: Staff agreed to keep members up-to-date via email as the Review Committee progresses through its process. IGG members should surface any information about the applicants that they feel is vital to consider during the selection process. The Review Committee will develop a ranked short list for IGG decision at their January 20 meeting.

Goals for co-design phase

The co-design phase with the 3 sites selected will occur February-May 2015. The following was proposed and discussed:

1. Asset mapping.
 - *Comment: need to figure out goals before talking about how to get there. Strategy needs to be a map between assets and goals – indicator discussion needs to be tied at the hip to logic model.*
2. Systems mapping
3. Partner development
4. Strategy selection
5. Indicator selection
6. Capacity building
7. Technical assistance topics, e.g.:
 - Community engagement, Harwood Institute?
 - Collective impact with a strong community voice

Staff presented some draft slides on Collective Impact (CI) model, developed for potential use in facilitating conversations with sites selected. Feedback included:

- Consider logo usage; none, King County and The Seattle Foundation together or a new COO logo?
- Consider doing a “light touch” session with applicants who don’t move on (balance with other needs for staff time).
- Need to devote some staff time to toolbox and learning community

Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 20, 2015 from 2-4 p.m. at the PHPDA offices. Topics anticipated for that agenda include: final selection of 3 place-based funding sites; Best Starts for Kids Levy; and Living Cities Grant (applying in Jan. or Feb, funding starting Apr. 1).